Interview Summary

Application No.

Examiner

Applicant(s)

09/156,952

P. Kathryn B x

Group Art Unit

oup Art Unit 1743

Ostgaard et al.



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) P. Kathryn Bex	(3) Joseph Capraro
(2) Brian Gaff	(4)
Date of Interview May 14, 2001	
Type: a) 🔀 Telephonic b) Uideo Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2)	applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	Mo. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: _1 Identification of prior art discussed: Julian (USP 3,825,143)	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NM. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the possible introduction of limitations which discribe the accessibility of the antirotation lugs with an external apparatus even when the cap is on the body of the vial. This is to overcome the anti-rotation lugs 19 and 22 disclosed in Julian, which cannot be engaged with an external apparatus when the lid is placed on the vial. Examiner agreed to consider the amendment.	
available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amer summary thereof must be attached.) i) X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAINCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPI already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM	record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). L WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST EP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

P. KATHRYN BEX
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1743

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1700